

A

REVIEW OF THE STATE OF THE BRITISH NATION.

Thursday, January 19. 1710.

AND now, Gentlemen, I must draw a Kind of a new-fashion'd Parallel, which for ought I know, may meet in the Center, as they say, Dr. Sacheverell's Parallel Lines were to do.

Ye have heard of one Dr. Sacheverell taken up by the *House of Commons* in *England*, and of one Mr. Greenshields imprison'd by the Lord Provost and Magistrates of *Edinburgh*— Let us examine the Parallel between them: *Sacheverell* your *English Greenshields*, and *Greenshields* their *Scots Sacheverell*.

Greenshields is prosecuted for Innovations on the Church of *Scotland*; *Sacheverell* for abhor'd Innovations on the Church of *England*.

Greenshields for setting up a new Worship (new to them) in *Scotland*; *Sacheverell* for preaching new and unknown Doctrine (new to us) in *England*,

Greenshields for insulting the Magistrates, and defying the Laws in *Scotland*; *Sacheverell* for insulting the Queen, Parliament, and Government in *England*.

Greenshields

Greenshields for a scandalous Bullying
the Union ; *Sacheverell* for *Ditto*
to the Revolution.

And how will these Parallels meet ?
I'll tell you, Dr. *Sacheverell* having been
impeach'd by the *Commons*, is deliver'd
up to the *Lords* to be try'd at their Bar :
Greenshields having been twice sentenc'd
by the *Lords* of the Session, once by the
Magistrates, and once by the Presby-
tery, has appeal'd to the *Lords*, and must
be finally sentenc'd at their Bar — —
And then you have two *Sacheverells* or
two *Greenshields* ; take them which way
you please — — The Tryal of Skill is of
the same Nature exactly — — they stand
upon the same Foot exactly.

Greenshields is rejected in *Scotland* ;
First, As not being really a Minister *in*
any Church, not a Clergy-man, and as
being Ordain'd by the Exauctorate De-
pos'd Bishops, who being by the Revo-
lution divested of the Sacred Office, or
at least of the Exercise of it by Parlia-
ment, and with the Concurrence of
the Royal Authority, *has no more* (say
we) *any Power to make a Minister* — —
They say, the Power of making a Mi-
nister remains in the Bishop, *tho' De-*
pos'd, and here lies the Dispute, which
really, *as not material*, I shall not enter
much into here, and perhaps I am not
Judge competent in the Matter — —
But this, I think, I may venture to say,
this Man pretends to call himself a Mi-
nister of the Church of *England* — —
Now, whether he may be a Minister
or no, is not to me so much the Que-
stion — as whether the Church of *Eng-*
land shall accept of such to be Ministers
in their Church, who receive the San-
ction and Consecration from those,

whose Authority in all Ecclesiastick
Matters *they utterly disown*, and who
they have depriv'd, dispossess'd, and
depos'd.

This Man calls himself a Minister
of the Church of *England*, tho' not Or-
dain'd, but by a *Scots Non-Jurant Bi-*
shop.

It seems to me an unquestion'd Con-
sequence, that if they will not receive
the Communion from their Hands, nor
the Word and Doctrine from their
Mouths, they should not receive Mi-
nisters from their Mould — — And tho'
I will not take upon me to determine
this Point, yet I cannot but give some
Thoughts of it : As to the Church of
England accepting of the *Jacobite De-*
priv'd Bishops ordaining Ministers for
that Church that has depos'd them, it
is objected, that they are acknowledg'd
Ministers, because, if the *Presbyterian*
Church were to receive them, they
would not re-ordain them.

First, I do not find, that it has yet
been try'd, as to a Man ordain'd in
this Manner; nor do I take it for
granted.

Secondly, Neither does the Church of
England, or any Protestant Church
in *Europe*, re-ordin a *Popish Priest*,
and yet they will not be content,
that the *Popish Bishop* shall imme-
diately ordain Protestant Min-
isters.

But — let us enquire a little into the
Authority of the Powers deposing these
Bishops in *Scotland*, and if it should ap-
pear, that by the same Power which
they granted themselves to be erected
upon *Qua Bishop*, they were again pull'd
down,

down, then it must follow, that they might by that Power so effectually be depos'd, as not to retain any Legal Authority to constitute a Minister.

I know, it is alledg'd in *England*, that the Supremacy of the King or Queen over the Church is subordinate to the Headship and Sovereignty of Jesus Christ, who is allow'd to be the Head of the Church; and therefore it is express'd in the Collect, which mentions the Supremacy in all Causes, and over all Persons, &c. *next and immediately under Thee and thy Christ, Supream Head and Governour*: And in this Case the Church of *England*, as all other Churches in the World, except the Instance I am upon, have some reserv'd Rights and some Independency, which the Sovereign cannot interfere with.—Whether the *Scots Episcopacy* can claim this or no, I shall leave to the *Act of Parliament*, by which they were establish'd, to determine, which really and absolutely seems to found its whole Hierarchy in the absolute Will and Dominion of the King, as may be seen in the Statute, to which I refer, as follows, in these Words.

FORASMUCH as, the Ordering and Disposing of the External Government and Policy of the Church doth properly belong to his Majesty, as an INHERENT RIGHT of the Crown, by Virtue of his Royal Prerogative and Supremacy in Causes Ecclesiastical—Be it Enacted, &c.—Vide 1 Act, 2 Session, 1 Parl. Cha. II. 1662.

Now, if these Gentlemen in *Scotland* acknowledge the whole External Government and Policy of the Church, to be vested in the Crown by an Inherent Right—They have actually given up the Divinity of the Institution, and the Crown, by whomsoever possess'd, has an Inherent Right to dispose, not

the Bishops only, but even *Episcopacy* it self—and to erect *Presbyterian*, or any other Church Government, the King or Queen should please.

If this be not granted, why then did they accept of being restor'd in *Scotland* in such Terms, and why did they claim to come into the Church there by Virtue of the King's Right, rather than that of GOD Almighty's? Indeed I must own, as this was vesting the Crown in a most Tyrannick Power over the Church of Christ, so it seems, as if nothing but a Tyrannick *Usurpation* upon the Kingdom and Authority of Jesus Christ could be a proper Foundation for such a Kind of Hierarchy.

But be that as it will; this is certain, that here is the absolute Inherent Right of the Crown, to the setting up what Church-Government it should please, *Recogniz'd by the Episcopal Establishment*: From whence I draw a few short Inferences, which to me seem rational; if those Gentlemen do not think so, I hope, they will excuse me in giving my Opinion.

1. That then Depositing *Episcopacy* was no Wrong done to any Body in *Scotland*, for being done by the Crown, viz. King and Parliament, it must be lawful, since, *ut supra*, the Ordering and Disposal of the Government and Policy of the Church, is an Inherent Right of the Crown.

2. That this confirms the Necessity of *Episcopacy* in *Scotland* being founded in, and depending wholly upon *Jacobitism*, since there can be no Objection against the restoring *Presbyterian* Church Government, but the Illegality of the Revolution; for if the Crown be rightfully devolv'd upon the Queen, then